

No. 9335. 40345

1-20



GIVEN BY

U. S. SUPT. OF DOCUMENTS

9335-415-3-5
SPECIAL SENATE INVESTIGATION ON CHARGES
AND COUNTERCHARGES INVOLVING: SECRETARY OF THE ARMY ROBERT T. STEVENS, JOHN G. ADAMS, H. STRUVE HENSEL AND SENATOR JOE McCARTHY, ROY M. COHN, AND FRANCIS P. CARR

HEARING
BEFORE THE
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON
INVESTIGATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON
GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS
UNITED STATES SENATE
EIGHTY-THIRD CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION
PURSUANT TO
S. Res. 189

PART 19

MAY 5, 1954

Printed for the use of the Committee on Government Operations



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1954

Boston Public Library
Superintendent of Documents

SEP 8 - 1954

COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

JOSEPH R. McCARTHY, Wisconsin, *Chairman*

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota

MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine

HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois

JOHN MARSHALL BUTLER, Maryland

CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas

HUBERT H. HUMPHREY, Minnesota

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington

JOHN F. KENNEDY, Massachusetts

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

ALTON A. LENNON, North Carolina

RICHARD J. O'MELIA, *General Counsel*

WALTER L. REYNOLDS, *Chief Clerk*

SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS

KARL E. MUNDT, South Dakota, *Chairman*

EVERETT MCKINLEY DIRKSEN, Illinois

CHARLES E. POTTER, Michigan

HENRY C. DWORSHAK, Idaho

JOHN L. McCLELLAN, Arkansas

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

RAY H. JENKINS, *Chief Counsel*

THOMAS R. PREWITT, *Assistant Counsel*

ROBERT A. COLLIER, *Assistant Counsel*

SOLIS HORWITZ, *Assistant Counsel*

CHARLES A. MANER, *Secretary*

CONTENTS

	Page
Index -----	I
Testimony of—	
Collier, Robert A., assistant counsel, Special Subcommittee on Investi- gations-----	720
Stevens, Hon. Robert T., Secretary, Department of the Army-----	720

SPECIAL SENATE INVESTIGATION ON CHARGES AND
COUNTERCHARGES INVOLVING: SECRETARY OF THE
ARMY ROBERT T. STEVENS, JOHN G. ADAMS, H. STRUVE
HENSEL AND SENATOR JOE McCARTHY, ROY M. COHN,
AND FRANCIS P. CARR

WEDNESDAY, MAY 5, 1954

UNITED STATES SENATE,
SPECIAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON INVESTIGATIONS OF THE
COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS,
Washington, D. C.

The subcommittee met at 10:45 a. m., pursuant to recess, in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building, Senator Karl E. Mundt, chairman, presiding.

Present: Senator Karl E. Mundt, Republican, South Dakota; Senator Everett McKinley Dirksen, Republican, Illinois; Senator Charles E. Potter, Republican, Michigan; Senator Henry C. Dworshak, Republican, Idaho; Senator John L. McClellan, Democrat, Arkansas; Senator Henry M. Jackson, Democrat, Washington; and Senator Stuart Symington, Democrat, Missouri.

Also present: Ray H. Jenkins, chief counsel to the subcommittee; Thomas R. Prewitt, assistant counsel; and Ruth Y. Watt, chief clerk.

Principal participants: Senator Joseph R. McCarthy, a United States Senator from the State of Wisconsin; Roy M. Cohn, chief counsel to the subcommittee; Francis P. Carr, executive director of the subcommittee; Hon. Robert T. Stevens, Secretary of the Army; John G. Adams, counselor to the Army; H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of Defense; Joseph N. Welch, special counsel for the Army; James D. St. Clair, special counsel for the Army; and Frederick P. Bryan, counsel to H. Struve Hensel, Assistant Secretary of Defense.

Senator MUNDT. The committee will please come to order. The Chair would like to begin the hearing this morning with the not altogether novel or startling announcement that the guests are here at the pleasure of our committee. We are happy to have you in the committee room. We have a standing rule of the committee that there shall be no manifestations of approval or disapproval at any time, and the officers have a prevailing order from the committee to politely escort from the room those who decide for themselves to violate that committee injunction. May the Chair say he was very happy—and I believe his memory is correct—that there have been no interruptions from the audience of any kind this week. Nobody has violated the rules and made manifestations of approval or disapproval.

We are ready to begin the proceedings.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Have you a point of order, Mr. Welch?

Mr. WELCH. I have a statement bearing on my relations with Mr. Jenkins that I would like to make. I have informed Mr. Jenkins of my desire to make it.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Jenkins has advised the Chair that you have so informed him that it deals with the general discussion we had yesterday morning. I think it perfectly appropriate that you should have the opportunity to make the statement.

Mr. WELCH. It is quite short. Yesterday in a open hearing I stated that by unanimous vote of the subcommittee at its executive session the previous evening a resolution was passed directing its special counsel, Mr. Jenkins, to confer with me and others in an effort to reach a formula to expedite or shorten these hearings. I stated that pursuant to that resolution Mr. Jenkins conferred with me. I further stated that I would not be satisfied with a formula whereby Senator McCarthy would follow Mr. Stevens and be subjected to an examination and cross-examination and that the hearing would then be ended.

I stated that Mr. Jenkins concurred with me in my opinion that this should not be done. Mr. Jenkins has conferred with me about what was said and it is now my opinion that my statement of yesterday morning left an erroneous impression, all of which was inadvertent on my part. What occurred was this: Mr. Jenkins agreed with me that the termination of this hearing on that formula would not enable any of the parties to present all of the facts pertaining to the issues. He did not express his opposition to such a formula, as he has always indicated that the question of curtailing or terminating this hearing was entirely up to the subcommittee.

Senator MUNDT. Does that conclude your statement, Mr. Welch?

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. Senator McCarthy, a point of order.

Senator McCARTHY. Not exactly a point of order, Mr. Chairman. There are two matters I would like to bring up. No. 1, the question of how long Mr. Stevens has been on the stand has been raised very frequently. He has been here a long time now. At the rate we were going yesterday, it will take many, many days to finish the cross-examination of Mr. Stevens. I have had one of my staff give me an estimate of the time we spent on the questions and the time on the answers and the interruptions.

Yesterday the best estimate we could get is that we spent between 20 and 25 minutes asking questions and the rest of the time was used up on what I considered very lengthy answers—I assume the Secretary thought he was answering correctly—and with interruptions. Keep in mind, of course, that Mr. Stevens is the accuser and I have no choice but to ask the questions. My staff has been accused of using improper pressure.

Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I think it is not exactly proper to keep one man on the stand as long as Mr. Stevens has been kept here. I would like very much, therefore, to have a meeting of the committee this noon to see if we cannot work out some system whereby we can give the Secretary a long weekend off so he can come back next Monday and start fresh. I just do not like to keep him here under these lights the rest of this week. I don't wish to discuss it now, Mr. Chairman,

but I would like to have a meeting of the committee this noon, if we could, in executive session so we could discuss what I have in mind.

Senator McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that we proceed with the hearings.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair would like to inquire, if I may, of Senator McCarthy whether this request for an executive session deals with trying to find some way, if he understands it, either of expediting the hearings or whether it is a suggestion that we find a way, if possible, to change the order of witnesses so Mr. Stevens, who has been under the lights and before the committee for a long time, could have a refresher period—I understood you to say perhaps until next Monday.

Senator McCARTHY. May I say, Mr. Chairman, I was not suggesting the executive session for the purpose of expediting. As I said before, I would not talk to Mr. Welch except under oath after the breaking of the agreement which we made the other day. I merely want to talk to the members of the committee about some way of giving Mr. Stevens a rest. He has not asked for one. He has not communicated to me that he wants one. I have had no indication from him that he wants a rest. I think he is entitled to one, and I would like to discuss with the committee a change in the ground rules without establishing a precedent so he can be taken off.

Senator JACKSON. We are not going to change the rules, are we, in the middle of the game?

Senator MUNDT. I would think no, but if we could find a way, it seems to me, to call some other witness and give Mr. Stevens a rest, the Chair, speaking for himself alone, feels that Mr. Stevens is entitled to a rest. He has been here a long time. He would certainly be persuaded tremendously by any suggestion which would not destroy the equity of the hearings or change the rules, but which would give Mr. Stevens a rest.

Do you wish to have a committee meeting for that purpose?

Senator JACKSON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest that if we proceed to put the monitored telephone calls into the record, that will take some time, and it would give Mr. Stevens an opportunity to defer his testimony until all those telephone conversations are placed in the record, which was acted upon by the committee so long ago I cannot remember—over a week, I guess.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, in that connection I would like to ask a question, if I may. There will be a question of which monitored calls are competent as to testimony, whether they are accurate, whether we have all of the monitored calls. I understand—if I am wrong, Mr. Jackson, I wish you would correct me—I understand that someone in the Army has supplied you with copies of all monitored calls. I have never seen a single one yet. Was I misinformed, Senator Jackson?

Senator JACKSON. I have not received copies.

Senator McCARTHY. Have you seen copies of them?

Senator JACKSON. I have not seen copies of the monitored calls. I have heard about them.

Senator McCARTHY. In other words, you have seen them?

Senator MUNDT. The Chair will call an executive committee meeting at 2 o'clock in my office, and I hope from it will come some formula by which we can relieve Mr. Stevens for the rest of the afternoon, and we hope he can get a rest, which he deserves.

Senator McCARTHY. I have another point, definitely a point of order.

Senator MUNDT. I want to be sure the committee members understand we will have an executive committee meeting in my office at 2 o'clock. You may be there, Senator McCarthy, and if you are there I think it is only fair for Mr. Welch to be there. We will be glad to have you come.

Mr. WELCH. The Senator has said such ungrateful things about me, sir, I think I should not care to attend.

Senator MUNDT. You may come, if you care to come. Have you a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. Yes, Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I understand the committee met and decided, and I think rightly so, to put in monitored phone calls if it is proven that you have all the calls and that they are complete. I understand that at least some members of the committee on both sides of the aisle have either received copies of the calls or have been fully informed as to the contents of the calls. I have not seen any of the calls. I do not think in view of the fact that Mr. Welch has seen all the calls, some of the committee members have, I believe it is only fair that I have access to those monitored calls also, so that I can check with my staff and determine whether or not they think that all of the calls have been included, whether some have been held out. I think this is doubly important, Mr. Chairman, in view of the evidence we had yesterday in regard to file stripping. I want to be sure there is no monitored stripping.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair holds that is a proper request that you may place before the executive meeting at 2 o'clock.

Senator McCARTHY. I would like permission of the Chair to read into the record a wire which I sent to Mr. Stevens this morning.

Senator SYMINGTON. I second the motion of Senator McClellan. It is now after 10 minutes to 11. I move the committee go to work.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair feels the wire should not be read, because the Senator is not testifying at this time. He may release any telegram he cares to the press, if he cares to, but he does not believe it should be incorporated into the record.

Senator McCARTHY. Then I would like to pass this wire to the Chair with the request that he subpoena the material mentioned within this wire. It has to do with the letter from J. Edgar Hoover, having to do with security risks at Fort Monmouth. May I pass that to the Chair?

Senator MUNDT. Senator Dirksen?

Senator DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, as everyone knows, Government is a continuous process. I get a little distressed over the fact when high administrative officials are immobilized day after day if it isn't necessary.

We haven't called on Mr. Hensel. It is undetermined as to when we shall get there. There are so many tensions on the international horizon and, as everyone knows, he is Secretary for the International Security Affairs. Certainly it isn't necessary to have both him and his counsel here. I wonder if the committee couldn't agree to let Mr. Hensel go back to work until such time as we have to have him.

Senator MUNDT. Is there any objection from any member of the committee to dismissing Mr. Hensel until he is called by the committee?

Senator McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether Mr. Hensel has requested that he be released from attendance. If he has, then I am willing to grant it. If Mr. Hensel feels that his presence here is needed in his own interest and in defense of the charges against him, I don't think this committee has any right to order him to stay away until he is called.

Senator MUNDT. Does the Chair understand any implication on the part of the Senator from Illinois that we were ordering Mr. Hensel to leave the room? I didn't get that. I thought it was that we were not ordering him to be here.

Senator DIRKSEN. That is right.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, it is certainly true that as Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs, Mr. Hensel has numerous matters of prime importance to the Nation piling up on his desk.

I would say this: That if we can have an understanding that Mr. Hensel's name will not be brought into the hearings in his absence, he will be prepared to return at any point and on any day or at any time when the suggestion is made that his name may come into these proceedings, and we shall come back.

If that is satisfactory to the Chair, satisfactory to everybody here, Mr. Hensel, I am sure, would appreciate the opportunity to attend to his important official duties.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Bryan, may I have your attention? May the Chair put it this way: It is obviously pretty difficult to be sure that Mr. Hensel's name might not be mentioned. But we should be able to agree that none of the issues involving him would be discussed.

If the Chair can get unanimous consent now from all members of the committee and staff, and counsel for all parties involved, that he may raise a point of order and sustain it against any discussion of the issues involving Mr. Hensel in his absence, if I can get that assurance now, then I would think Mr. Hensel might safely absent himself from the hearing.

Does the Chair hear any objection to that?

Senator MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Senator McCarthy?

Senator MCCARTHY. I don't quite understand the Chair's suggestion. Do you mean in cross-examining witnesses we cannot mention Mr. Hensel's name? I may say in that connection I intend to examine the Secretary this morning on a question which he was clearly being generous in, I will say, in error yesterday. He testified yesterday Mr. Hensel was not present when he returned from a meeting with the Chair, myself, Senator Dirksen, Senator Potter. The night that someone thought up the smear, apparently, on Mr. Cohn and Mr. Carr, I find out Mr. Hensel was present and that Mr. Stevens apparently had a considerable conference with him. So I will bring up that question.

Senator MUNDT. I would assume for such questions Mr. Hensel ought to be present. I don't know.

Senator MCCARTHY. I want to make it clear that I will not refrain from asking witnesses pertinent questions about Mr. Hensel. When Mr. Adams is on the stand, I will ask him about Mr. Hensel. I will say this, Mr. Chairman, I certainly will be glad to go along with the Chair insofar as not raising any new issue as far as Mr. Hensel is concerned, but I can't refrain from questioning these witnesses as

they appear. It is doubly true, Mr. Chairman, in view of the fact that one of the allegations which we have is that Mr. Hensel master-minded the smear. I don't think Bob Stevens did. I can't help, therefore, but ask questions about him. May I say also, Mr. Chairman, for the benefit of Mr. Hensel and his counsel while they are here, I am not sure this has been set forth clearly and concisely enough so that they are fully warned. I do think the allegations in our specifications are broad enough to cover it, and I want to notify Mr. Hensel that when he gets on the stand, and when other witnesses are on the stand, I will discuss in some detail, from the standpoint of motive on his part, his activities in Europe after he was notified that he would be given the job he has now got. From the standpoint of motive.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair believes, Senator Dirksen, in view of the type of questioning that the Senator said he is going to be engaged in this morning, Mr. Hensel might properly want to be here.

Mr. BRYAN. Mr. Chairman, I think we will at least remain through this morning.

Senator MUNDT. Very well, sir. Counsel Jenkins?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, yesterday afternoon the committee instructed me to confer with J. Edgar Hoover with respect to a copy of a letter allegedly in the files of the Intelligence Department of the Army, and to clarify that issue this morning. I am now prepared to do so. Prior to so doing, I desire to ask the Secretary one question.

TESTIMONY OF HON. ROBERT T. STEVENS, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Stevens, since yesterday afternoon, have you or not, through yourself or those under your command examined the files of the Intelligence Department at the Pentagon with special reference to the original of the letter about which you were questioned yesterday afternoon?

Secretary STEVENS. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. State whether or not such a letter was found in that file or any other file.

Secretary STEVENS. No, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Now, Mr. Chairman, I desire the Secretary to stand aside momentarily and let me clarify that issue. I desire to call as the next witness my assistant counsel, one of my assistant counsel, and a member of my staff, Mr. Robert A. Collier.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Collier, will you take the witness stand, please.

Mr. Collier, will you raise your right hand. Do you solemnly swear the testimony you are about to give will be the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, so help you God?

Mr. COLLIER. I do.

Senator MUNDT. You may be seated, sir.

TESTIMONY OF ROBERT A. COLLIER

Mr. JENKINS. Will you please state your full name?

Mr. COLLIER. Robert A. Collier.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Collier, you are a member of my staff, assistant counsel; is that correct?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Collier, formerly have you or not been employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation?

Mr. COLLIER. I was, sir. I was employed from April 1, 1941, until October 26, 1951.

Mr. JENKINS. You were present yesterday afternoon when a discussion occurred with respect to a letter. Will you give the date of the letter, Mr. Collier? It has escaped me.

Mr. COLLIER. January 26, 1951.

Mr. JENKINS. At which time the committee instructed me, either myself or by some member of my staff, to confer personally with Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

Mr. COLLIER. I was present.

Mr. JENKINS. Were you present?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. I will ask you whether or not at the close of the meeting I assigned that task to you.

Mr. COLLIER. You did, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. State whether or not pursuant to that, Mr. Collier, you conferred with Mr. Hoover personally.

Mr. COLLIER. I did.

Mr. JENKINS. At what time, approximately, yesterday afternoon or evening?

Mr. COLLIER. From approximately 5:15 until approximately 7:15.

Mr. JENKINS. During the course of your conversation with Mr. Hoover, I will ask you whether or not he called upon you to procure and show to him the copy of the letter about which we are talking.

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir; he did.

Mr. JENKINS. I believe dated January—

Mr. COLLIER. Twenty-sixth, 1951.

Mr. JENKINS. January 26, 1951. As a result of that request of Mr. Hoover, did or not you go to Mr. Cohn's office and procure that copy?

Mr. COLLIER. I did.

Mr. JENKINS. And then take it to Mr. Hoover?

Mr. COLLIER. I did.

Mr. JENKINS. Was it shown to him?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Collier, now at this time, without my taking the time and still in the interest of expediting the hearing, I ask you to chronologically relate the incidents of that conference with Mr. Hoover, what was done pursuant to the request of the committee, and what was said to you by Mr. Hoover.

Mr. COLLIER. Upon receiving your instructions, I communicated with the FBI and within a very short period of time obtained an appointment with Mr. Hoover. I went to see him, having advised him of the date and the type of letter involved. Mr. Hoover at that time informed me that they had not found such a letter. He did have another letter of the same date.

In order to be perfectly sure that they had obtained the correct letter, I returned to the Senate Office Building and obtained from Roy Cohn, in Senator McCarthy's office, the letter which I now have in my hand and which was the one produced yesterday by Senator McCarthy. I took that letter to Mr. Hoover, and at that time he compared this letter with the letter in his possession of the same date.

I can now report to you that Mr. Hoover advised me that this letter is not a carbon——

Mr. JENKINS. Identify the letter when you say "this letter."

Mr. COLLIER. This is the letter produced yesterday by Senator McCarthy. This is not a carbon copy or a copy of any communication prepared or sent by the FBI to General Bolling on January 26, 1951, or any other date. The FBI has in its files a letter——

Mr. JENKINS. Are you now stating what Mr. Hoover personally told you?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. You may proceed.

Mr. COLLIER. The FBI does have in its files a file copy of a letter dated January 26, 1951, the same date, prepared and sent by the FBI to General Bolling, which was a 15-page interdepartmental memorandum. A carbon copy of that went to Maj. Gen. Joseph F. Carroll, United States Air Force.

Mr. Hoover, in comparing the two documents, advised me that the form of the carbon copy which I have, the one introduced, and the yellow copy of the FBI memorandum prepared on January 26, are materially different in form.

I can recount for you, as Mr. Hoover advised me, the difference in that form.

For purpose of identification, I will refer to the document introduced yesterday as the carbon copy and to the yellow copy in the FBI files, the 15-page memorandum, as the FBI original. On the FBI original the words "Federal Bureau of Investigation" is printed in large block letters across the top of the page. On the carbon copy the words "Federal Bureau of Investigation" is typed. The date, January 26, 1951, appears directly beneath the type "Federal Bureau of Investigation" on the carbon copy, and is in a different position on the page of the FBI original.

The carbon copy has across the top "Personal and Confidential via liaison." The FBI original has in the upper righthand corner the words "Confidential via liaison."

The memorandum, the FBI original, is in the form of a interdepartmental memorandum. It is not signed. It merely carries the name of the Director and the FBI. The carbon copy would indicate a signature was to be affixed.

The FBI original was addressed to Maj. Gen. A. R. Bolling. The carbon copy is addressed to Major General Bolling, the initials "A. R." being left out.

The same words "Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, Department of the Army," appear on both documents. In the FBI original the additional words "The Pentagon" appear. That is not on the carbon copy, and the words "Washington, D. C." appear on both documents.

The FBI original has the word "From" and then the words "John Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation." That is not on the carbon copy.

The FBI original has the word "subject" and then typed thereon "Aaron, A-a-r-o-n, Hyman H-y-m-a-n Coleman, C-o-l-e-m-a-n, Espionage—R." The "R" stands for Russian and——

Senator McCarthy. Mr. Chairman, I am not sure I understood. You say that is the FBI copy you are talking about.

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir. In other words, the subject Aaron Coleman, Espionage—R, appears on the FBI original. It does not appear on the carbon copy.

This carbon copy carries the salutation "sir." The FBI original carries no salutation.

This carbon copy is two and one-quarter pages in length. The FBI original is 15 pages in length.

The carbon copy at the end carries the words "sincerely yours, J. Edgar Hoover, Director." That, of course, did not appear at the end of the FBI original, but actually appeared in the "To" "From" relation in the beginning.

The carbon copy shows no carbon copy being sent to anyone else.

Senator McCARTHY. Could I interrupt, Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. Have you a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. Yes. I think it would be proper at this time, as a point of order, that we show that I had wired Mr. Stevens and asked him to produce the additional pages that we did not have. I thought it was eight pages. Now, the young man says it is 15 pages. I believe I asked for eight pages. I think the record should show that I had wired Mr. Stevens and told him that I would ask to have the additional pages subpoenaed.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair suggests you bring that out in your 10-minute period that you have for questioning.

Senator McCARTHY. Let me ask the Chair, has the Chair acceded to my request, the request made to Mr. Stevens also by wire, that the additional pages be subpoenaed, the pages which I do not have? I think they should be subpoenaed.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair has not had time to examine the telegram which you sent to the desk.

Mr. COLLIER. I would like to pass to the Chair the diagram which I have drawn which will give you a more visual reference to the two letters which I have brought out.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, may I make a point of order? When the witness discusses the carbon copy, he might say the alleged carbon copy.

Senator McCARTHY. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I would like to know who alleged it to be a carbon copy. We have never alleged it to be a carbon copy.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Collier, you may proceed.

Senator MUNDT. Proceed, Mr. Collier.

Mr. COLLIER. The FBI original, on the last page thereof, shows the following:

cc, Major General Joseph F. Carroll, Director, Special Investigations, the Inspector General, U. S. A. F.

Now, that is the difference in form alone. I am distinguishing between form and substance. Mr. Hoover advised me, and examined the 2 documents in my presence, advised me that the substance of the original FBI 15-page memorandum and the substance of the 2¼-page carbon copy, contain information relating to the same subject matter, and that in some instances exact or identical language appears in both documents.

Other than that, Mr. Hoover feels that to further clarify it would reveal, possibly reveal, the substance of the documents themselves.

On that point, Mr. Hoover asked me to inform you that he respectfully refers the committee to the Attorney General for his opinion as to whether or not the contents can be made public in line with security requirements. And since the language is, in some instances, identical, that would apparently go for both documents.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Collier, have you in detail related all of the events transpiring in your conference with Mr. Hoover?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. JENKINS. I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Just one question. The Chair is not certain, and I am not sure that you can answer this question, but did you determine whether the FBI original was in the files of the military and available to Secretary Stevens?

Mr. COLLIER. I will go back to the question that Ray asked me. I did not complete it. On that point, I determined that the yellow copy in the FBI file, which is the file copy, carries the following handwritten notations concerning the original:

Delivered to Colonel Cramer, G-2, 1-27-51, W. R. P.

Those initials are those of a liaison representative of the FBI, Wesley P. Reynolds.

The carbon copy to Major General Joseph F. Carl, according to a handwritten notation on the yellow, was delivered to Gill Levy, O. S. I., 1-29-51, E. S. S., the initials standing for Ed S. Sanders.

Senator MUNDT. In other words, those originals were apparently delivered in 1951?

Mr. COLLIER. They were, sir.

Senator MUNDT. And were delivered to G-2 at that time?

Mr. COLLIER. The memorandum is dated January 26. It was delivered personally by Mr. Wesley P. Reynolds to Colonel Cramer on 1-27-51. The carbon copy was delivered personally by Mr. Ed Sanders to O. S. I., on 1-29-51.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair understands that the white papers that you hold are not an exact duplicate or replica of the yellow sheets which you held.

Mr. COLLIER. The yellow being my notes.

Senator MUNDT. The yellow being from the files of the FBI and the white from Senator McCarthy?

Mr. COLLIER. No, sir. The yellow sheets are merely my own notes, my handwritten notes. The yellow copy of the 15-page document I did not examine because it contains security information. I did not go into the substance of the document itself. I did not feel entitled to. I received my information from the examination made by Mr. Hoover. That yellow copy is now in the possession of the FBI.

Senator MUNDT. Now I understand. You were quoting Mr. Hoover, then, when you said that in some instances the language was identical, that the subject matter was identical, and that as Mr. Hoover interprets the security laws, the subject matter, both of the FBI copies and of the copies from Senator McCarthy's files, because they deal with an identical subject, should not be revealed in public short of a ruling of the Attorney General. Is that correct?

Mr. COLLIER. I want to make it clear. Mr. Hoover did not, of course, refer to this carbon copy when he stated that, because actually this is not a carbon copy of any FBI document. He was referring to

his own document, the 15-page memorandum, when he suggested that "I respectfully refer you to the Attorney General for his opinion."

Senator MUNDT. You were speaking for yourself, then, when you said that because J. Edgar Hoover had told you in some instances the language was identical, the subject matter was identical, that you believed that without authorization from the Attorney General we should not discuss the subject?

Mr. COLLIER. That is correct. Mr. Hoover made no comment concerning this carbon copy.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Just a minute. The Chair would then think, Mr. Counsel, that we would not want to subpoena the FBI original, certainly, without getting some opinion from the Attorney General.

Mr. JENKINS. Counsel entirely agrees with the chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Have you a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to point out, I think this should be explored with Mr. Hoover. As far as I know, if the Chair will refer to page 2 of the hearings where this letter lists the names of individuals at Fort Monmouth, I understand the FBI report gives the names of informants and information. That security information was omitted from this copy, call it what you may, which I have.

I would like to know, Mr. Chairman, and the witness has not covered that, apparently he can't because he says he has not examined the letter, whether or not all portions of this document, which was—

Senator MUNDT. That is a question which you should address to the witness, not to the Chair. It would not be a point of order, I don't think.

Senator McCARTHY. No, Mr. Chairman, it is a request of the Chair, and this is a very, very important matter, Mr. Chairman. It is a request of the Chair that I am making.

I am making the request that someone from the FBI be called to tell us whether or not all of the language in the document submitted yesterday is not identical to the language in the document submitted to the military, with the exception of where we list the name of an individual and put the word after it "derogatory," in some cases not derogatory, that the FBI report actually contains all the information.

I should think we should ask Mr. Hoover whether or not he would object to having put into the record—this is a request I am making of the Chair. May I finish, Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. Is it a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. I am making a request of the Chair, a very important request. The request is this: We have a document here concerning Fort Monmouth, Communists at Fort Monmouth, and a warning relating to them. I want to know, Mr. Chairman, if the Chair will not now call someone from the Bureau who can bring down the document they have, not for public exhibition, and tell us whether or not all the language is not identical, except that in this document the individuals are merely named and all security information is left out of this document, where in the FBI document the security information is included.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair would suggest that the Senator from Wisconsin first interrogate the witness, when he comes to his time, as

to whether he can provide that information. It is possible that he can, Senator McCarthy.

Senator McCARTHY. All right.

Senator MUNDT. Senator McClellan?

Senator McCLELLAN. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order that the document that is presented to us here, which we have not read, if incomplete, if it contains only 3 pages out of a 15-page document, then the best evidence is the document itself, which is available unless it is prohibited for security reasons.

If it is prohibited by security reasons, then these excerpts from it are not admissible at this hearing. If it is not prohibited, under the security order and directive of the President, then the original document in full and complete is the best evidence and should be produced.

I therefore, Mr. Chairman, suggest that this document that is not identified other than as containing some of the names and some statements in the original document, has no place in these hearings until it is established that the original document is not available or, if, for security reasons it cannot be made available, then no part of it can be made available at this hearing.

Senator MUNDT. If the Chair understands the suggestion of Senator McClellan, it is this: That we have our counsel undertake to determine now from the Attorney General whether we can have made available the 15 sheets, and if so, we can then make our own comparison as to whether or not the material is left out, what was left out, and what is retained. If we are not able to get the 15 sheets, and since they deal with identical subjects, then none of the material should be admitted for security reasons, is that right?

Senator McCLELLAN. That is correct.

Senator MUNDT. Do you have a point of order, Senator McCarthy?

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, while I agree considerably with what the Senator from Arkansas said, I would say that I think it should be made clear that we are not now requesting and never have requested that the security information about these specific individuals be made a part of the record. That is in line with the ruling of counsel, Mr. Jenkins. I do think that the language of the letter, if this language is correct and verbatim—and I have every reason to believe it is—that the language of the letter contains nothing of a security nature except that it warns, admonishes those in charge of Fort Monmouth.

Senator MUNDT. The letter is not admissible.

Senator McCARTHY. The Chair has stated that unless the entire 15 pages could be made a part of the record, none of it could. I want to disagree with that, Mr. Chairman. I think you can delete, as there apparently was deleted in this letter, the security reports on each specific individual. The rest of the letter, I think, is extremely important.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair is ready to rule. Unless his ruling is upset by his colleagues on this committee, he will rule that the counsel for the committee should seek from the Attorney General the permission suggested by Senator McClellan, which has been restated by him and by the Chair.

Senator JACKSON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Jackson.

Senator JACKSON. Does not the committee have the responsibility, in view of the fact that there is now or was introduced yesterday afternoon a letter which purports to have come from Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and which we are now advised did not come from him—does not this committee have the responsibility to ask the Attorney General or somebody where that letter came from? Mr. Hoover's name is being used, and I take it from the witness that he—that is, Mr. Hoover—has denied the existence of this letter. Is that correct?

Mr. COLLIER. This letter is not a copy of any document prepared by the FBI.

Senator JACKSON. Or one that he sent out?

Mr. COLLIER. That is correct.

Senator JACKSON. I think the committee has a grave responsibility here to determine where that letter came from.

Senator MUNDT. I think that would be a separate request, and it might well be a proper one, but I think what we want to find out immediately is whether or not we have a letter or a letter in a memorandum, an inner office communication, which is admissible in evidence.

Mr. Counsel, if you will determine that and try to get it available for evidence, if it does not violate rulings of the Attorney General.

Mr. JENKINS. That will be done, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. That will be done. I may state a point of order.

Senator McCARTHY. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. The Chair says you should request of Mr. Brownell permission to use the entire 15-page document. I would like to ask the Chair to request that if you cannot use the entire 15-page document—I assume he will rule against you on that because it contains the names of informants—ask him whether or not we can use that portion of the document which was submitted yesterday. Find out whether this is a verbatim copy of the FBI memorandum or letter and, if so, whether there is any objection to introduction of the part of the document, omitting the names, which I submitted yesterday.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair suggests that that would be perfectly proper to find out whether we could include any or all or at least enough to find out whether that is a verbatim copy. We will get from him whatever we can for use as evidence in this case.

Have you a further point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. I have. Mr. Jackson has made a completely false statement. He said I represented yesterday that this came from Mr. Hoover. I made it very clear that I had never received anything from J. Edgar Hoover; that this was not received from Mr. Hoover. Mr. Jackson knows that.

Senator JACKSON. I am not saying that you said it came from Mr. Hoover. Here is a letter purporting to come from Mr. Hoover. It is signed by him.

Senator McCARTHY. Would you like to get the evidence on it before you make wild statements?

Senator JACKSON. I am not making wild statements. The committee—and certainly it was pretty clear from the testimony yesterday or the discussion here that this was a letter purporting to have been signed by J. Edgar Hoover. I think we ought to know where it came from.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, a point of order. Mr. Jackson has tried very deliberately to create the impression that this did not come from J. Edgar Hoover. I am sure the evidence will show that this did come from J. Edgar Hoover and that there has been omitted from it——

Senator MUNDT. You can take that up in testimony with the witness.

Senator McCARTHY. If Mr. Jackson is going to testify, I have to correct his misstatements, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. He has testified. You have testified and neither testimony has been under oath. The Chair suggests that counsel proceed.

Senator JACKSON. A point of order, Mr. Chairman. I want the record to show that on yesterday, so that we have clear the understanding——

Senator MUNDT. May the Chair suggest if you are willing to wait until your 10-minute time comes, because it will be just a minute.

Senator JACKSON. I want to make the point in connection with the point of order previously made.

Senator MUNDT. Very well, a point of order.

Senator JACKSON. That on page 1722 of the record of yesterday, I asked the question:

May I ask this question? I am a little confused. This is a copy of a letter that is being introduced.

That is quite clear. I made that statement. It wasn't denied. Again, this is what Mr. Jenkins said on page 1723.

Senator McCARTHY. Are you reading what you said, Mr. Jackson?

Senator JACKSON. I just read what I said. Now, I am reading what Mr. Jenkins said on page 1723:

Mr. JENKINS. I am getting ready to. I hold now on the basis of the copy of this letter, and on the assumption that no party in interest and no counsel would refer to a spurious, manufactured document that Senator McCarthy's cross-examination of the Secretary with reference to this letter is wholly competent—?

And again, on page 1724, Senator McCarthy said this——

I want to question the Secretary as to whether or not the original of this and other letters like it are in his file.

Then again, on page 1725 of the record, this is what Senator McCarthy said:

If Mr. Welch is going to say that there is not a copy of this in the Army files, he should be sworn, because that statement is untrue.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman?

Senator JACKSON. That is pretty clear-cut. May I repeat that, Mr. Chairman?

Senator McCARTHY. Is this a point of order?

Senator JACKSON. It is a point of order. The point is that the representation was made that yesterday this was not represented as a copy of a letter from Mr. Hoover. This is Senator McCarthy's statement on page 1725:

If Mr. Welch is going to say that there is not a copy of this in the Army files, he should be sworn, because that statement is untrue.

That is Senator McCarthy's statement.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. Have you a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. I very definitely have, of the same nature as Mr. Jackson's. We have a document here which, according to all the information I have, is verbatim, a report given from the FBI. It should be in the Army files. I sent a wire this morning to the Secretary asking for the addendum showing the derogatory material on each side. I think it is important for Mr. Jackson not to make these statements and try to create these impressions when he hasn't seen the letter. If he will look at it, I believe he will find each and every word is identical to the original letter with the exception of the fact that where there is listed the names of Fort Monmouth employees and the word "derogatory" put after it in the FBI report you will find the derogatory information and perhaps the names of the informants. If that were included in this letter, Mr. Chairman, then it would be objectionable. We would be violating the rule by submitting it to the committee. That security information is not in the letter. The meat of the letter is here, and I would suggest that we proceed now to examine this young man and see if he can give us this information or not.

Senator JACKSON. Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair will state that he has already ruled that counsel is to secure from the Attorney General the evidence which we can get if available to us, which will determine the answers to the questions now being discussed under the guise of a point of order. Once we get that evidence, certainly the documents before us can be compared and the facts brought out. I suggest, Senator McClellan, you proceed with the questioning.

Senator McCLELLAN. Did you discuss with Mr. Hoover or inquire of him how many copies of that 15-page memorandum were made?

Mr. COLLIER. The FBI presently has in its file the yellow file copy. The original was sent to General Bolling and a carbon copy was sent to General Carroll. To my knowledge, no other copy is in existence.

Senator McCLELLAN. Did he state to you specifically whether any other copies were released or transmitted to anyone else at the time?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir. The yellow copy indicates the distribution of all copies, and the only distribution shown on the yellow copy was that the original went to General Bolling and a carbon copy went to General Carroll. The other distribution would not be shown.

Senator McCLELLAN. In other words, the records of the FBI, according to Mr. Hoover, indicate that there was only the original which went to General Bolling and the yellow carbon copy which was placed in the permanent FBI files. Is that correct?

Mr. COLLIER. That is what the yellow shows. I don't want to speak for Mr. Hoover. It may be that—

Senator McCLELLAN. I think it is pretty important to find that out. I would like for you to inquire of Mr. Hoover about that.

Mr. COLLIER. All right, sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. I would like to trace this letter or this memorandum. If this information that is alleged to be a part of that document did not come from Mr. Hoover, and no other letter was released, then the only source it could have come from was the security files of the Army.

Mr. COLLIER. Let me say, again, Senator McClellan, that Mr. Hoover said that this was not a carbon copy or a copy of any communication. sir.

Senator McCLELLAN. I am talking about the information in this document that has been presented to us. It had to come from either the carbon copy in the FBI files or from the original that went to the Army.

Mr. COLLIER. I will check on that. The United States Air Force received a copy.

Senator McCLELLAN. All right. That is all.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Dirksen?

Senator DIRKSEN. Mr. Collier, you did not have opportunity to examine the text of the copy in the FBI files?

Mr. COLLIER. Senator Dirksen, I purposely avoided examining it.

Senator DIRKSEN. You would therefore have no opportunity or did not have opportunity and would not know whether language was identical insofar as the pages available are concerned?

Mr. COLLIER. Well, Mr. Hoover did say that it contains information relating to the same subject matter and that in some respects the exact language in both documents is the same.

Senator DIRKSEN. That is all.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Jackson?

Senator JACKSON. In talking with Mr. Hoover, did he say that the two letters were similar? That is, the one presented here yesterday and the interdepartmental memorandum, that is; that the FBI forwarded to the Army and a copy to the Air Force? Or were they entirely different?

Mr. COLLIER. I don't want to put words in his mouth. He did not use the word "similar"; no. But, again, I will use his language, that in some respects the language in both documents is the same.

Senator JACKSON. In one case it is a three-page letter, I believe.

Mr. COLLIER. Two and one-quarter pages.

Senator JACKSON. Two and one-quarter and the other is 15 pages?

Mr. COLLIER. Fifteen pages; yes, sir.

Senator JACKSON. Is the letter that was presented to the committee yesterday a synopsis of the interdepartmental memorandum that the FBI sent?

Mr. COLLIER. Well, to answer that question, I would have to characterize it myself. If you want my characterization, based upon what my examination of it—

Senator JACKSON. Based on your conversation with Mr. Hoover.

Mr. COLLIER. This is, understand, my opinion. He did not make this statement and it is not to be attributed to him. Don't indicate that in any way. It is purely my statement. It is my opinion that the document presented here yesterday is a summary of the 15-page document.

Senator JACKSON. In the form of a letter?

Mr. COLLIER. The form as distinguished from the substance was materially changed; yes, sir.

Senator JACKSON. The point is that it is represented that these two documents are the same.

Mr. COLLIER. They contain the same language in some respects.

Senator JACKSON. Yes; but I am talking about throughout.

Senator MUNDT. I believe Mr. Collier testified he did not have an opportunity to read the 15 pages. It is a bit unfair to him to ask him to tell if it is the same if he didn't read it.

Senator JACKSON. I mean based on your conversation with Mr. Hoover?

Mr. COLLIER. They do relate to the same subject matter, that is what Mr. Hoover said, that they do relate to the same subject matter.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. Does the Senator have a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. Yes, sir; a point of order.

Mr. Jackson has just stated without qualification that it was represented that this was a carbon copy of the same. If he had examined the letter, he would find that on page 2 it is indicated in parentheses that security information is omitted in two different places.

I think before the Senator makes these statements he should examine yesterday's document unless he has the reluctance that Mr. Stevens had to glance at it.

Senator JACKSON. Well, I haven't had a chance to see a copy of it. It was marked "personal," I believe, and "confidential" on the letter, and it was suggested that the matter be first taken up with the FBI before we all started reading it. I didn't read it.

Did Mr. Hoover indicate to you where this letter that was introduced and presented to the committee yesterday might have come from?

Mr. COLLIER. That was the first time, of course, that he ever saw it. The only document in the Bureau files is the carbon copy or the yellow copy of the 15-page memorandum. This is not a copy of any document in the Bureau files.

Senator JACKSON. That is all.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Potter?

Senator POTTER. Mr. Collier, did Mr. Hoover in his conversation with you state that it was possible that they could give a summary of the 15-page document without having a copy of this document in their file?

Mr. COLLIER. No. No; I would say that Mr. Hoover searched the files, had the files searched, and the only memorandum that was sent to General Bolling on that date was the 15-page memorandum and there is no other—there is no copy of this [indicating], or anything like it in the Bureau files. The only thing is the 15-page interdepartmental memorandum that was sent to General Bolling and a carbon copy to General Carroll.

Senator POTTER. Is it my understanding that that letter that you hold in your hand is not signed but it is typed "J. Edgar Hoover"?

Mr. COLLIER. The difference, basically, is that this is in the form of a letter. It starts out with a salutation of "Sir" and at the end "Sincerely yours, J. Edgar Hoover, Director."

Whereas, the FBI original 15-page document was in the form of "Date: January 26, 1951; to: Major General A. R. Bolling; From: John Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation," and that was set out.

No signature appeared on that document. That is not the type of document that is signed.

Senator POTTER. Did Mr. Hoover express to you any interest about that document?

Mr. COLLIER. No, sir. I merely talked to him concerning the facts as to whether or not this was authentic. I did not get an opinion from him. I did not ask for it and he did not volunteer it.

Senator POTTER. Did he express any opinion as to whether the Army or the Air Force, who had, I assume, the large 15-page document, could have made a synopsis of the 15-page document in the 2½-page letter that you now have and sent it out as a report from J. Edgar Hoover?

Mr. COLLIER. I can state categorically that Mr. Hoover in my presence did not venture any such opinion.

Senator POTTER. Thank you. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Symington?

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Collier, am I correct that Mr. J. Edgar Hoover asked you or suggested to this committee that prior to the publication of this document, that it be—that the matter be consulted with the Attorney General of the United States to see whether the publication of the document was in the interests of the security of the United States?

Mr. COLLIER. That is correct, Senator Symington.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I hope that we carry out the recommendations of Mr. Hoover in that regard prior to releasing the document.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair ruled that he would do that, at the suggestion of Senator Symington, some 10 minutes ago.

Senator SYMINGTON. May I then say that I reemphasize that it be done, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. It will be done.

Senator SYMINGTON. I would like to point out, if I may, to the committee that yesterday I made a notice of the fact that the document was not signed by Mr. Hoover. One of the reasons for doing that is that I have received a great many documents from Mr. Hoover during my term of office in the executive branch of the Government. I never received one in this form.

That is all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. Senator Dworshak?

Senator DWORSHAK. Mr. Collier, do you know enough about the procedure in the FBI to know whether it has been customary when carbon copies of any letters are furnished to have the Director sign his name or whether the name is merely typed by the stenographer?

Mr. COLLIER. I spent a little over 10½ years in the FBI. The last six I spent in an administrative capacity writing such memoranda as this, so I have some knowledge of them. The memorandum that was sent on January 26, 1951, is, as I said, an interdepartmental memorandum. It does not, on the original, carry any signature or any initial. The yellow copy in the Bureau files does carry the signature of the person who actually prepared the memorandum, dictated it, and the typist who typed it, as well as those approving that memorandum. In some instances those go all the way to Mr. Hoover, and he personally initials them. In some instances when he is out of town on business, someone else does it in his behalf.

This memorandum which I have in my hand, which is the one brought in, is in the form of a letter—"Sir" and "Very sincerely yours"—which would require, then, a signature, J. Edgar Hoover. The memorandum is different from the form being used at that time. The interdepartmental memorandum, may I add, is the type that was then and is used by the FBI in corresponding with other Gov-

ernment departments and agencies in the general course of its business.

Senator DWORSHAK. Is it customary or not for Mr. Hoover to sign a carbon copy of a letter like that?

Mr. COLLIER. He would not sign the carbon copy of a letter that goes out over his signature. He would sign the original.

Senator DWORSHAK. His name would be typed by the stenographer on such a copy?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Welch?

Senator MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, just a question on the order of questioning.

Senator MUNDT. You will follow Mr. Welch.

Senator MCCARTHY. I understood the Chair to say at the opening of the session that Mr. Welch would have the first opportunity to question his witnesses, that I would have the first opportunity to question mine. This young man is called for the purpose of testifying in regard to a document which I asked to have introduced. While I don't—

Senator MUNDT. The Senator is right as far as understanding the rule of the Chair is concerned, but Mr. Collier was here neither as an Army witness nor as Senator McCarthy's witness but as a committee witness; so the Chair, exercising his jurisdiction, has called on Mr. Welch.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Collier, am I correct in thinking that you did not read the 15-page document in the files of the FBI?

Mr. COLLIER. You are correct. I purposely avoided it because it contains security information.

Mr. WELCH. I do not know what your answer will be, but may I ask whether or not you read the short document about which I shall question you in a moment?

Mr. COLLIER. It has been a little hard, I will admit, to carry it around all night and not read it to some extent. However, I will say truthfully that insofar as possible I have avoided reading the entire document. I merely read it with the idea of identifying it.

Mr. WELCH. That, Mr. Collier, is because you are as sharply aware as I am that it is a crime to hand these documents around, is that right?

Mr. COLLIER. That, I am afraid, sir, will have to be your characterization, not mine.

Mr. WELCH. You know it is a crime to disclose this security information, do you not?

Mr. COLLIER. As I understand it, there is a Presidential directive which requires all personnel to refrain from disclosing any information containing loyalty or security data.

Mr. WELCH. Were you in the courtroom yesterday when I declined to read the letter?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WELCH. And when Secretary Stevens declined to read the letter?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WELCH. I have observed as of now so far as it was humanly possible for you to do so, you have declined to read the letter, is that right, sir?

Mr. COLLIER. I have, sir.

Mr. WELCH. Would you hand me this hot document which I will not read? I wish to call your attention only to what I saw yesterday. You, of course, have read the address, haven't you?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir, I have. I read the address and part of the form rather than the substance.

Mr. WELCH. Right. I think I will do no wrong if I read the heading: "Federal Bureau of Investigation January 26, 1951." Are you following me, sir?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir.

Mr. WELCH. Then appears the words which I read yesterday and which startled me so: "Personal and Confidential via Liaison." Is that right?

Mr. COLLIER. That is correct.

Mr. WELCH. Then this purported carbon copy of a letter has this appearing: "Major General Bolling, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C., Sir." Is that correct?

Mr. COLLIER. That is correct.

Mr. WELCH. Now, passing the body of it and going only to the conclusion, it appears at the bottom of it: "Sincerely yours," comma, and then typed in capital letters "J. Edgar Hoover, Director." Is that right?

Mr. COLLIER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Collier, as I understand your testimony this document that I hold in my hand is a carbon copy of precisely nothing, is that right?

Mr. COLLIER. I will say that Mr. Hoover informed me that it is not a carbon copy of a memorandum prepared or sent by the FBI.

Mr. WELCH. Let us have it straight from the shoulder. So far as you know, it is a carbon copy of precisely nothing?

Mr. COLLIER. So far as I know, it is, yes, but that again is a conclusion.

Mr. WELCH. So far as you know, this document in this courtroom sprung yesterday by Senator McCarthy is a perfect phony; is that right?

Mr. COLLIER. No, sir. That is your conclusion. I will not draw such a conclusion.

Mr. WELCH. You just told us it is a carbon copy of precisely nothing, haven't you?

Mr. COLLIER. I have said it is not a copy of a document in the FBI file. I will not say that it is a copy of nothing because if it was typed as a carbon there must have been an original.

Mr. WELCH. You would think so, but we can find no trace of an original, can we?

Mr. COLLIER. Not yet.

Mr. WELCH. Anywhere?

Mr. COLLIER. No, sir.

Mr. WELCH. No, sir. If no original of this document can be found, will you go along with me, sir, with my quaint English when I say it is a copy of precisely nothing?

Mr. COLLIER. You are assuming that the original cannot be found?

Mr. WELCH. That is right.

Mr. COLLIER. My investigation yesterday was to determine whether this was an authentic document. I have made no investigation to

determine whether the original can be found or not. It may be that it can be found.

Mr. WELCH. You can't find a copy of it in the FBI place, can you?

Mr. COLLIER. No, sir.

Mr. WELCH. Now, you do not on your investigation—strike it out. You are not as you sit in this chair in possession of a single fact which will allow you to believe that the document which I now show you is a carbon copy of any existing original letter?

Mr. COLLIER. I made an examination yesterday to determine whether this was a copy of a document prepared or sent by the FBI. I have not made any examination to determine whether it is a copy of an original now in existence.

Mr. WELCH. Have you any doubt, sir, that it was presented in this room as if it were a carbon copy of a letter signed J. Edgar Hoover, Director, and addressed to Major General Bolling?

Mr. COLLIER. I was present when it was presented, and I do not now remember the exact manner in which it was presented.

Mr. WELCH. Did you have any doubt, sir, that your superior, Mr. Jenkins, was handed a document which he believed to be a carbon copy of a letter?

Mr. COLLIER. That would be for Mr. Jenkins to say.

Mr. WELCH. Did you believe it was a carbon copy of a letter when you first heard it in this room?

Mr. COLLIER. It was referred to as a copy of a letter.

Mr. WELCH. Yes, sir.

Mr. COLLIER. And I observed it. I can draw no further conclusion from it.

Mr. WELCH. And now, as you sit in this room, you are unable to tell us on all the information you have been able to obtain last night—

Senator MUNDT. Somebody raised a point of order from the audience, which the Chair will overrule. I will ask the audience to please refrain from any audible comment.

Mr. WELCH. I don't know whether we have a radio audience or not, but I was disturbed by someone in the back of the room.

Senator MUNDT. One of the officers, I think, spoke a little loudly in talking to one of our guests. Would you repeat your question, Mr. Welch, or have the reporter do it.

Mr. WELCH. Would you read it as far as I have gone?

(The reporter read from his notes as requested.)

Mr. WELCH (continuing). Whether or not this letter is a carbon copy of any letter actually in existence?

Mr. COLLIER. I am unable to make that statement, because my examination last night was directed at one purpose and one purpose only, and that was to determine the authenticity of this particular document with documents in the Bureau files.

Mr. WELCH. All right. Now I want to try some more simple language on you, sir: You know what we have here purports to be a carbon copy of a real letter, don't you?

Mr. COLLIER. It is a carbon copy of a letter.

Mr. WELCH. Now, if I were to use the simple words which I think you will understand, and say to you is this document the real McCoy or a phony, which of those two words would you use?

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman?

Mr. COLLIER. I would pick neither. Mr. Welch, may I say to you this—

Mr. WELCH. But suppose I asked you to choose between the two, which would come more nearly to the point—

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman.

Senator MUNDT. The Senator from Wisconsin is addressing the Chair and so is counsel. I will recognize counsel first.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Welch, I must say that Mr. Collier has answered that question you have just asked him, and I do not think your last question is a proper question because it has hertofore been answered by Mr. Collier.

Mr. WELCH. I do—

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. Senator McCarthy, have you a point of order?

Senator McCARTHY. Yes. I think the Chair should insist upon certain rules of honesty on the part of counsel for Mr. Stevens and Mr. Adams. If he examined this document which he considers so hot he wouldn't ask these questions of the young man, because he would see that on the second page it very clearly indicates that there is omitted security information. He knows that and should know it, and as I say, I think there should be certain rules, even on your part, Mr. Welch, certain rules of honesty in cross-examination.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair has not read the letter and Mr. Welch has not read the letter, so I suppose we labor under some difficulties.

Mr. WELCH. We do. I have higher standards in respect to my own conduct in respect to these documents than the Senator and his staff does. I do not think it is proper for Mr. Collier to read it and he has declined to read it. I do not think it would be proper for Mr. Welch to read it and he has declined to read it. I await with much interest the Senator's explanation of how it reached his hands and whether he read it.

Senator MUNDT. Have you concluded your questions?

Mr. WELCH. I have.

Senator MUNDT. Senator McCarthy has 10 minutes.

Senator McCARTHY. May I make it very clear that as far as I am concerned, the Truman directive, or any other directive, will preclude me from examining material bearing upon the security of this Nation. I am very surprised when I find Mr. Welch here worried about disclosing information on Communists, sitting back and slyly approving the violation of the law insofar as eavesdropping is concerned and monitoring. So there is no question about Mr. Collier, Mr. Chairman, there will be no personal and confidential material where it shows that someone is covering up and hiding Communists.

Now, Mr. Collier, I am going to ask you, in view of Mr. Welch's questions, to examine the second page of this letter, the top of it—I am not going to ask you to read what you find there, but ask you whether that does not indicate that there has been omitted background security information on an employee, the parenthetical expression.

Mr. COLLIER. Senator, I am unable to say whether anything has been omitted, because I have not examined the original document.

Senator McCARTHY. I will ask you to examine the copy which you have, look at the top of the page and see if you do not find in paren-

theses the explanation that security information on a certain employee has been omitted from this letter.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I think——

Senator MUNDT. Have you a point of order?

Mr. WELCH. Yes. Counsel should rule as to whether or not this witness may properly examine this document. It is not in my province to rule.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. May the Chair suggest to Senator McCarthy that if we succeed as we hope we will, in getting from the Attorney General the material which has been requested, we will then all have before us the document so we can make a comparison.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, we are interested in the truth here. Mr. Welch is apparently afraid of it. I am asking the simple question of whether or not the document on its face doesn't show that security information was omitted, and that it does not show that this never could deceive anyone, to indicate that all of the FBI security information was included. I ask this question of the witness.

I will insist, Mr. Chairman, that it be answered unless the committee votes me down on that. There is no reason why anyone should be afraid of the truth insofar as this document is concerned.

Mr. COLLIER. Senator McCarthy, may I say that I, as an assistant counsel to Mr. Jenkins, am here to get the facts. I don't think it is our purpose nor our right to draw conclusions in any form. I have examined this document, as I have so testified, at the beginning and at the end, in order to establish what kind of document it is, in order to identify it. I have not read the contents.

The part you speak of is on page 2. I feel that in view of the security requirements I should not read that second page.

Senator McCARTHY. I am asking you to look at the top of page 2, which contains nothing in regard to security, but shows that the security information was omitted. I ask you to look at that parenthetical expression. It is very important to establish that fact now, in view of the repeated statements by Mr. Welch that this was a phony, and that anyone had a right to believe that all of the security information was in it.

Mr. Chairman, it is important to get at the truth of this right now.

Mr. COLLIER. Senator McCarthy, I feel that I must respectfully decline to read it and determine those facts from it.

Senator McCARTHY. I am going to ask the Chair——

Senator MUNDT. The Chair believes the witness has a right to decline to read confidential information if he prefers not to read it and the Chair will not order him to read it if he so declines.

We are waiting for a ruling from the Attorney General to cover precisely the points that the Senator is now discussing.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Collier, let me ask you this question, dropping down to page 2, to the end of paragraph 2, do you find in effect, that the information concerning the individuals listed has been omitted?

Mr. COLLIER. No, sir; I have not made that observation. I have looked at page 2; I find that on page 2 there are a list of names.

Senator McCARTHY. Now, if you have looked at page 2 before you should not refuse to look at it right now.

Mr. COLLIER. I only looked at it to determine what it looked like. I can identify page 2 by the list of names on it and nothing more. And I don't know the names. I merely know that there are a series of names on the page. I have not read it.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Collier, you were appointed by Mr. Jenkins to find out whether or not this is a duplicate of information or a summary of information in regard to Communists at Fort Monmouth or in the military.

I now ask you to look at page 2. You will find a list of names. I am not asking you to read those names off, but I am asking you to tell us whether or not this copy does not clearly show, that there was omitted from page 2 all of the FBI reports and these individuals, that their names are merely listed and the notification after them as to what was shown, derogatory or not derogatory.

Mr. COLLIER. Senator McCarthy, as far as I am concerned personally, that goes to the substance of the memorandum itself, and without a ruling by the Attorney General, which Mr. Hoover has suggested that the committee secure, I do not feel entitled to read the document for the purpose of ascertaining the facts you suggest.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Collier, do you mean to tell us you did not read this document?

Mr. COLLIER. I purposely avoided reading this document in its entirety, as I so testified.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I wonder how ridiculous we can get here. I am trying to have this young man just look at the letter, he has carried it around in his pocket all night, and tell us whether or not on page 2 it isn't made very clear that there has been omitted from this document the FBI security information, and that there is no security information in this document.

It is a very simple request to be made, Mr. Chairman, and I think I am entitled to get that answer.

Senator SYMINGTON. Mr. Chairman?

Senator MUNDT. Senator Symington, have you a point of order?

Senator SYMINGTON. I bow to the chairman with great respect.

Senator MUNDT. The witness has stated that he declines to read the letter. He has been instructed by J. Edgar Hoover that it contains information which is identical to the information which he felt the Attorney General should rule upon, and the Chair is not going to order the witness to do something that he thinks he should not do.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Collier, you say that the Director told you the language was identical in some respects; is that correct?

Mr. COLLIER. That is correct, in some respects.

Senator McCARTHY. Did he tell you that the language was identical in all respects—

Mr. COLLIER. No.

Senator McCARTHY. Except that this three-page document omitted the security reports furnished by the FBI; that other than that the document is complete?

Mr. COLLIER. No, sir; he did not state it in that way.

Senator McCARTHY. Well, now, what did he tell you?

Mr. COLLIER. He told me that the language is identical in some respects and that it relates to the same subject matter; that both documents relate to the same subject matter. That was as far as he felt he was entitled to go.

Senator McCARTHY. Did he tell you there was any twisting, any distorting, any violation of the language used in the report that he sent over, except to eliminate the security information?

Mr. COLLIER. He made absolutely no comment concerning the language. He did not characterize it in any manner.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Collier, were you not interested when you went over there in finding out whether or not this did in any way twist or distort or violate any of the original language?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, I was originally, but when I determined that the Director felt that the document was of a security classification and that he deferred to the judgment of the Attorney General as to whether or not that should be read by anyone, including myself, I did not pursue that line of inquiry.

Senator McCARTHY. May I ask counsel for the Army, so the Attorney General will know the attitude of the parties to this dispute, whether counsel for the Army will consent to having the 15-page document, with the security information deleted, and this document made public so that the press and the public can compare the two documents?

Mr. WELCH. Thank you, Senator, for finally referring to me as counsel for the Army.

Senator McCARTHY. It was a mistake. I apologize.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Welch has the floor.

Mr. WELCH. It is not in my jurisdiction, sir, to pass on the security matters. The Attorney General will have to do that.

Senator McCARTHY. I know. I just asked whether or not we can transmit to the Attorney General the information that both counsel for Mr. Stevens and Mr. Adams, as well as Senator McCarthy, request that they make the 15-page document public if there is deleted any security information, and that also we make public the document which I have submitted after deleting the names on page 2.

Mr. WELCH. I have not read the document that is referred to. It is impossible for me to form any judgment of that sort. That would have to be left to the Attorney General.

Senator McCARTHY. I get your attitude very clearly.

Mr. Collier, I assume that you are unable to contact General Bolling to see whether or not someone in his office had ever made a summary of the 15-page report.

Mr. COLLIER. That is correct. I did not make that line of inquiry, either.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest that Mr. Collier or someone be designated to contact General Bolling's office and find out whether or not they made a summary and, if so, the distribution of that summary and whether or not this is an accurate summary made by Bolling's office.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair will take that suggestion along with the ones earlier made by Senator Jackson and bring them before the subcommittee in its executive meeting which we will hold in my office this afternoon at 2 o'clock.

Senator McCARTHY. In any event, Mr. Collier, is it your testimony that you are of the impression—and you are not attributing this to Mr. Hoover, but it is your own personal impression after talking with Mr. Hoover—that this is a summary of the 15-page document?

Mr. COLLIER. Again may I say that Mr. Hoover did not so characterize it. He did not make any comment on it. I was asked for my personal opinion. I give it as such: My personal opinion is that this document, this carbon copy, is in the nature of a summary of a 15-page document prepared by the FBI.

Senator McCARTHY. Just in closing, Mr. Collier, may I make it very clear that in my vigorous examination of you I do not want that to be construed by anyone to mean that I do not have confidence in your ability. I am fully aware of your background. I think that you would make an excellent addition to any staff, period.

Mr. COLLIER. Thank you.

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Cohn has some questions.

Senator MUNDT. Have you finished?

Mr. COHN. I have some questions.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Cohn.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Collier, is this much very clear from what you have been able to tell us at this time: That on the date Senator McCarthy mentioned yesterday, January 26, 1951, there was transmitted, under the name of John Edgar Hoover, to Army Intelligence a document?

Mr. COLLIER. I will restate it, Mr. Cohn. Under date of January 26, 1951, a 15-page FBI memorandum was prepared. The original of that memorandum was transmitted to General Bolling's office via liaison on January 27, and the carbon copy to General Carroll's office via liaison on the 29th.

Mr. COHN. Sir, did this memorandum go to the Army under the name of John Edgar Hoover?

Mr. COLLIER. Yes, sir. On the memorandum there are the printed words "date, to, from, and subject"; and beside the word "to" was the identification, "Major General A. R. Bolling, Assistant Chief of Staff, G-2, Department of the Army, The Pentagon, Washington, D. C.," and beside the word "from," "John Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation."

Mr. COHN. You say printed. Were they not typewritten?

Mr. COLLIER. They were typed.

Mr. COHN. Typewritten words, "From, John Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation"?

Mr. COLLIER. That is correct.

Mr. COHN. And, sir, is it a fact, on the basis of what you can tell us now, the subject matter of this 15-page memorandum from Mr. Hoover to the Army on that date was Aaron Coleman, then at Fort Monmouth, espionage?

Mr. COLLIER. I will say this: That after the word "From" and the designation "John Edgar Hoover, Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation," there followed the word "Subject" and typed thereon was "Aaron Hyman Coleman, Espionage—R." For your information the R stands for Russian.

Mr. COHN. The "R" stands for Russian.

Senator MUNDT. Your time has expired, Mr. Cohn.

Does counsel have further questions? The Chair has none. Any Senators to my right? Any questions by Senators to my left?

Mr. Welch, any further questions?

Mr. WELCH. Just one question.

The typewritten document that we have had in the courtroom this morning does not purport to be a summary of anything; does it?

Mr. COLLIER. I think the document speaks for itself.

Mr. WELCH. My question is: It doesn't purport, it doesn't say at the top of it, "Summary," does it?

Mr. COLLIER. No, sir; it does not.

Mr. WELCH. It just looks like a letter beginning with a salutation; is that right?

Mr. COLLIER. The salutation "Sir."

Mr. WELCH. And ending with—

Mr. COLLIER. "Sincerely yours."

Mr. WELCH. Thank you.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Cohn or Senator McCarthy?

Senator McCARTHY. Just 1 or 2 questions.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair expresses the hope we can finish with Mr. Collier before the lunch hour.

Senator McCARTHY. In view of Mr. Welch's question that this does not appear to be a summary, I ask you to look on page 2 and tell us whether or not it does not clearly appear to be a summary, that you have in parenthesis the definite information that there have been deletions from this document, of security information. In view of the fact that you, I assume, do not feel you can answer that, Mr. Collier, I will state for the record that that is the case, and I hope that all the Senators will examine this.

I have just one other question to ask of the Chair. In view of Mr. Welch's statement that was a phony, I ask that the Chair write a letter to the Director of the FBI, J. Edgar Hoover, and ask him whether or not this is not an accurate summary merely having deleted the security information.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair has already stated that he would take up your earlier suggestion, the suggestion of Senator Jackson and now your present suggestion, at the executive committee meeting we have called for 2 o'clock.

Senator McCARTHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Cohn has a few questions.

Mr. COHN. I think we left at this point: This memorandum sent under the name of John Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, to the Army, dated January 26, and I believe you said delivered on January 27, sir?

Mr. COLLIER. That is correct.

Mr. COHN. Bears the heading "Aaron Coleman, Espionage-R."

Mr. COLLIER. Aaron Hyman Coleman.

Mr. COHN. Espionage-R, and you now tell us that the word "R" stands for Russian.

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Hoover told me I could say that the "R" stands for Russian.

Mr. COHN. So you can tell us this morning that the 15-page memorandum was a communication from Mr. Hoover to the Army concerning Aaron Coleman and Russian espionage. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. COLLIER. That is what the "To" and the "From" read, and the subject is Aaron Hyman Coleman, Espionage-R.

Mr. COHN. Can you, Mr. Collier, as having been present in the room and a member of Mr. Jenkins' staff, tell us from the testimony of

yesterday and the public record, that on the day this memorandum was sent over from Mr. Hoover, Aaron Hyman Coleman was the section head in the secret radar laboratory at Fort Monmouth?

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Cohn, I cannot tell you that of my own personal knowledge.

Mr. COHN. I would ask the Chair, then, to take judicial or chairman-wise notice of the public hearings of this committee of December 8, 1953, which indicate that. I believe I read the job description of Mr. Coleman into the record yesterday.

Now, sir, can you tell us whether Senator McCarthy stated with completely accuracy yesterday that this 15-page memorandum, that this memorandum by Mr. Hoover, was a warning to the Army that at the secret radar laboratories at Fort Monmouth a group of associates of Julius Rosenberg and people with Communist records were operating on a secret link and chain radar project at that time?

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Cohn, I cannot tell you of my own personal knowledge. I was busy on some other matters. I was in and out of the room. I didn't hear that complete statement. The record would speak for itself.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Collier, I think a key question at this point is this: Have you also ascertained whether or not the Army has in its files at this time the original of this memorandum from J. Edgar Hoover, concerning Russian espionage and Aaron Coleman of the radar laboratory at Fort Monmouth?

Mr. COLLIER. I did not ascertain that. Mr. Stevens was asked to furnish that information this morning. As I recall, his testimony was that he had not found this document, but he did not say whether or not he had the original of the 15 pages. I only know what the records of the FBI revealed, and that is that the document was delivered on January 27, via liaison.

Mr. COHN. Mr. Chairman, at this time might we request that an additional series of documents which we have reason to believe were transmitted to the Department of the Army over a period of time in January—from January 3, 1951, up through the present day, concerning Communist activities of people employed at Fort Monmouth, memoranda such as this from John Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI, to the Army, may we ask that those likewise be produced by Mr. Stevens here this morning or this afternoon, that they be made a part of the record but be withheld until such time as a request is made of the Attorney General, but that the documents be made available and held in readiness, so that the public may have the story of the FBI warnings to the Army on the subject.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair suggests that you have Senator McCarthy make that request of us at executive session. We have already announced that we will subpoena all records, all documents, all individuals connected with this case, provided, of course, no security regulations are violated.

Senator MCCARTHY. Mr. Collier, just one question. In discussing this matter with Mr. Hoover, did you get the impression which I may say I have gotten, that the FBI transmitted all of the information which they had in regard to Russian or Communist espionage to the proper departments and that any failure to act, any failure to remove people like Aaron Coleman or anyone else, was not the fault of the FBI because they gave all the information they had, conducted

thorough investigations, but was the fault of the people involved as the supervisors to the suspected espionage agents?

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Hoover did not make any such statement to me, and did not talk about that to me. I will tell you from my personal experience in the FBI that all information of a security nature is promptly forwarded to all interested Government agencies, and that it is not evaluated, it is merely furnished as facts gathered. The FBI does not make any evaluation. It merely furnishes the information as it is obtained.

Senator McCARTHY. Just one further question: I ask this because so many people try to blame the FBI when we find Communists in various departments. It is true, is it not, that the FBI has no power to hire or fire anyone, their only power is to send down the report, conduct the investigation, and hope that the security agencies involved will act; is that correct?

Mr. COLLIER. Again, Senator McCarthy, I am speaking for myself, from my experience in the FBI. The FBI does not have any power to hire or fire anyone other than its own personnel. It gathers information, in a factual form, forwards that information either in reports or memorandums to the interested Government officials, and it is incumbent upon them to properly evaluate it in line with the desires that they have to use the information.

Senator McCARTHY. One other question now. The fact that the memorandum had the notation, "espionage, Russian," would indicate it was a report upon Russian espionage, would it not?

Mr. COLLIER. Again, may I speak from my personal experience. I am not contributing this in any way to Mr. Hoover, I want to keep that clear. From my personal experience in the FBI, in preparing reports and in gathering information, it is necessary to classify it. We, I say we meaning the Bureau, arbitrarily has set up certain classifications, internal security and espionage, and then the "R" which in this case stands for Russian, identifies the nationality group.

Senator McCARTHY. So that then there can be no doubt in anyone's mind that this report upon a man who is head of the important section in the secret radar laboratories, was being reported on, a 15-page report, and that had to do with Russian espionage?

Mr. COLLIER. Well, I don't want to leave any false impression. The "espionage-R." is routine. It is not abnormal in any way to be on a document. That is used under the proper designation and is a routine classification placed thereon.

Senator McCARTHY. By routine, you mean if it deals with Russian espionage, it would be routine to put the "R" on it.

Mr. COLLIER. That is right.

Senator McCARTHY. If it dealt with any other type of espionage, it would not be routine to put the "R" on it?

Mr. COLLIER. The proper designation would be put on it.

Senator McCARTHY. So when you say it is routine—let me get this straight. We are dealing here now with a secret radar laboratory, dealing with a report on a man who is head of an important section. There can be no doubt in anyone's mind, the "R" indicated that the information in the 15-page report dealt with Russian espionage and also dealt with Aaron Coleman?

Mr. COLLIER. That is hard to answer because you say it dealt with Russian espionage. The espionage R is an arbitrary designation that is given to the type of investigation. Now, it might well be that an investigation starts out with the allegations that there was espionage and it would turn into some other type. The espionage R is merely for filing purposes and for the use of the Bureau in determining how to carry on the investigation, how to classify it. This is not an unusual document in that it has espionage R. Many documents emanating from the Bureau carry the classification "espionage R."

Senator McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I know that the Chair has ruled on this, to some extent, before, but I think this testimony makes it doubly important that we strongly urge the Attorney General to make available for the public those parts of the document which show that this did deal strongly with Communist espionage at the radar plant.

Senator MUNDT. The Chair has already ruled on it over an hour ago.

Senator McCARTHY. No further questions.

Senator MUNDT. Does anybody have further questions of Mr. Collier? If not, Mr. Collier, you are dismissed and it is fair to say you have been an excellent witness and we appreciate the forthright, prompt, decisive answers you have made.

Mr. COLLIER. Thank you, sir.

Senator MUNDT. Mr. Counsel and members of the committee, I believe it is 12:20. I believe we have an executive meeting at 2 o'clock. What is the pleasure of the committee? Do you want to recess now?

We will recess until 2:30 this afternoon, with an executive committee meeting in my office at 2 o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 12:20 p. m., the committee was recessed, to reconvene at 2:30 p. m., the same day.)

INDEX

	Page
Adams, John G	719, 736, 739
Air Force (United States)	722, 723, 730, 732
Army (United States)	720, 722, 728-730, 732-734, 739-742
Army files	728, 729
Army Intelligence (G-2)	722, 734
Assistant Chief of Staff (G-2, Army)	722, 734
Assistant Secretary of Defense (International Security Affairs)	719
Attorney General (United States)	724-727, 729, 732, 737-739, 742
Bolling, Maj. Gen. A. R.	722, 729, 731, 734, 735, 739, 740
Brownell, Mr.	727
Bryan, Frederick P.	719
Carl, Maj. Gen. Joseph F.	724
Carr, Francis P.	719
Carroll, Maj. Gen. Joseph F.	722, 723, 731, 740
Cohn, Roy M.	719, 721
Coleman, Aaron Hyman	722, 723, 740-743
Collier, Robert A., testimony of	720-744
Communists	725, 736, 738, 742, 744
Cramer, Colonel	724
Department of the Army	720, 722, 728-730, 732-734, 739-742
Dirksen, Senator	719
Europe	720
Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI)	721-725, 727, 729-731, 733-735, 737, 738, 740-743
Federal Government	718, 732, 743
Fort Monmouth	718, 725, 726, 729, 738, 740, 742
G-2 (Army Intelligence)	722, 734
Government of the United States	718, 732, 743
Hensel, H. Struve	718-720
Hoover, J. Edgar	718, 721-725, 727-735, 738-743
Inspector General (USAF)	723
Intelligence Department (Army)	720
International Security Affairs	718, 719
Levy, Gill	724
McCarthy, Senator Joe	716-719, 721-729, 731, 733, 734, 736-744
McClellan, Senator	718
OSI	724
Pentagon	720, 722, 740
Potter, Senator	719
Presidential directive	726, 733
Radar laboratories (Fort Monmouth)	742, 744
Reynolds, Wesley P.	724
Rosenberg, Julius	742
Russian espionage	741-743
Sanders, Ed S.	724
Secretary of the Army	716, 720, 723, 724, 728, 731, 736, 739, 742
Secretary for the International Security Affairs	719
Special Investigations (Inspector General, USAF)	723
Stevens, Robert T.	716, 723, 724, 728, 731, 733, 736, 739, 742
Testimony of	720
United States Air Force	722, 723, 730, 732
United States Army	720, 722, 728-730, 732-734, 739-742
United States Army (Intelligence Department)	720
United States Attorney General	724-727, 729, 732, 737-739, 742
United States Government	718, 732, 743
Washington, D. C.	722, 740



BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY



3 9999 05442 1738

